

*The Address—Mr. Shaw*

**Mr. Shaw:** The hon. member said, "May I answer you?" No, he may not, because it is my time. Why waste time?

**Mr. Lesage:** He said, "May I ask a question?"

**An hon. Member:** What do you know about it?

**Mr. Lesage:** I heard it.

**Mr. Ellis:** How many speakers are there in the house?

**Mr. Shaw:** Shall I proceed?

**An hon. Member:** With what?

**Mr. Shaw:** Reference was made by the hon. member to another matter, and I feel it essential that I also make reference to it. For what reason or for what purpose or with what fear I am not certain, but he referred to the so-called sterilization law. He did not say so, but he definitely left the impression that this legislation had been sponsored by the Alberta Social Credit government and put on the statute books during their tenure of office. That is not true.

**Mr. Studer:** There were amendments.

**Mr. Shaw:** That legislation was put on the statute books of Alberta by the government which preceded the present government. That legislation was endorsed by the legislative assembly of the province. It came into being as a consequence of widespread requests. It has been used most sparingly and with tremendous care, and applies only to the mentally ill and then only where treatment has failed. Administration is under a medical board with representation from women's organizations. The consent of relatives is necessary. I emphasize that it applies only to the mentally ill when treatment has failed. Why the hon. member said that if he came under the jurisdiction of such legislation he would immediately jump in the ocean and start swimming remains for him to explain.

I wish to make only one other reference to the speech of the hon. member. I do not know that I can figure out what this means, as it is really a confusion of words. As far as I know it has not been corrected. Nevertheless I am going to read it as it appears on page 207 of *Hansard* of January 14. The hon. member is reported as having said:

Did you read the recent commission's report in New Zealand, where there was a Social Credit government of what Social Credit is?

I am not suggesting that he was not mistaken or misquoted—perhaps it was taken down incorrectly—but that is as it appears. I know what he was referring to. He was referring to a dispatch which came out of

New Zealand written by Douglas Leiterman of the Ottawa bureau of the Southam news service, I believe dated December 27, 1956. I am rather surprised that he did not have that dispatch before him.

The dispatch referred to a royal commission which had been set up to examine into monetary policy and so on. Of course if one had gone back to read of the events leading up to it and had read the evidence, as I have, he would know that the commission had been set up for one purpose only, to try to destroy the Social Credit movement in that country, a movement which had been able to secure 14 per cent of the national vote in the 1954 election.

The heading of this dispatch is all wrong because it says "Royal commission killed Social Credit." No royal commission can kill Social Credit; no inquiry can kill Social Credit. Hearings have been held here, but with what result? There has been a steady increase in the membership and growth and strength of the movement. It will interest the hon. member to know that never has the New Zealand association had a larger membership than it has now, never has it been in a better financial position.

Then the next headline is, "Nobody even laughs at it anymore." I can remember the days when there was much laughter in this country, but people laughed only when we were weak. They quit laughing when they realized that as a force in the affairs of this nation we were no longer a joke. If it is true that nobody laughs any more we can take that as one of the best signs based on our experience in Canada.

There is another thing I want to mention about this dispatch. Is our next election going to be characterized by guided political missiles? I understand that the Minister of National Health and Welfare went on a rather lengthy tour. Fine; I support the idea. He was cementing friendly relations, which is a good and admirable objective. He participated in Colombo plan discussions, which was an admirable thing. It was also admirable that he should take other people along, some to publicize his trip.

However, to the extent that Canadian taxpayers may have in any way financed Mr. Leiterman's trip, even if only by providing free transportation, I object. I object to that sort of thing because the report is designed deliberately for one purpose and one purpose only at this time, on the eve of an election. The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek has demonstrated the purpose for which it is to be used. I object as a Canadian taxpayer and as a Social Crediter to having any part of my taxes used,